DETAILED ACTION

1.   In response to the Preliminary Amendment filed on July 22, 2005 and November 29,

2005, claims 1-96 have been cancelled and the newly added claims 97-181 are pending.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 97 is objected to because of the following informalities: Another claim 100 is

appeared to type in the end of claim 97. It is suggested that after "console 100." delete "100.

The method … game consoles.", so as to overcome the typographic error. For continuingly

prosecuting the Office Action, claim 97 is treat as the suggestion above. Appropriate correction

is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 97, 99, 100, 105-112, 114-119, 121, 122, 126, 127, 130-142, 148-158, 164-166

and 171 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olsen (U.S. Patent No.

6,146,273).

        Re claim 97, 109, 110, 126, 127, 130, 132, 133, 136-138 and 155: Olsen discloses a

method of awarding a prize in a gaming system including a plurality of game consoles (Fig. 2:

objects G1-Gk, as pertains to claim 132) comprising: providing a trigger value derived from a

random variable having a non-uniform distribution (column 14, lines 19-32: states that the

random distribution is distributed highly in areas between the limits and not distributed in areas

outside of the limit. Thus, the distribution is not uniform as it is improbable of a number being

selected outside the limit.); periodically receiving count data from each game console, the count

data representing at least one parameter of a game console (column 14, lines 44-49: states

monitoring the coin information of each gaming machine as pertains to claim 130,135, and 155,

as well as the accumulator of claim 133); calculating a total value representing the total count

data received ; comparing the total value with the trigger value (column 15, lines 1-6: calculates

the total count data and compares this value to a trigger value to decide if the two values are

equal); and transmitting a prize instruction signal to an output means if the total value has a

predetermined relationship with the trigger value, whereby the prize instruction signal results in

at least one game console issuing a prize (column 15, lines 1-6, 41-45: wherein the total value is

equal to the trigger value as pertains to claims 109, 110, 127, and 136).

Re claim 99: Olsen discloses that the prize instruction signal is output from the output

means to at least one game console (column 15, lines 41-45).

Re claims 100 and 140: Olsen discloses that the output means is connected to a display

means which indicates that a prize has been won by the at least one game console (column 26,

lines 39-48; column 31, lines 3-5).

Re claim 105: Olsen discloses with respect to claim 97 wherein the prize is determined

independently of the count data (column 27, lines 1-13: the prize is determined based on a

paytable and not based on count data).

Re claim 106: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 97 wherein the prize instruction signal is output to the gaming console from which count data was received which resulted in the total value having the predetermined relationship with the trigger value (column 3, lines 10-12 & column 7, lines 65-67 & column 8, lines 1-5: a prize wherein each game machine in Olsen contributes count data to the game controller that results in the trigger value).

Re claims 107 and 150: Olsen discloses with respect to the method in claim 97, that data is collected synchronously with game play on each gaming console (column 14, lines 59-60: discloses an optional delay between counting of bets from each play at a game machine).

Re claims 108 and 151: Olsen discloses that the count data is collected asynchronously with game play on at least one gaming console.

Re claims 111 and 112: Olsen discloses with respect to the method of claim 97 wherein the count data represents one game played on one game console (column 14, lines 44-48: wherein the count data represents a bet at each gaming machine, as pertains to claim 112).

Re claim 114: Olsen discloses with respect to the method of claim 97 including a controller (Fig. 2: object 200), a trigger value generator (object 218), a jackpot triggering means (object 218), and a display means separate (Fig.7, object 10) from each gaming console.

Re claims 115 and 116: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 114 wherein the system includes a storage means for storing count data (column 6, lines 4-10: the current jackpot value is the total count data that accumulates after each monetary input by the game machines, as pertains to claim 116).

Re claim 117: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 116 wherein the controller provides the random trigger value (column 7, lines 50-60).

Re claims 118 and 119: Olsen discloses with respect to the method in claim 97 including the step of providing a new random trigger value at a predetermined time interval (column 8, 35-44: the predetermined time interval is a bonus game has been completed and a prize had been awarded).

Re claims 121, 122 and 166: Olsen discloses a controller use in a gaming system, the controller comprising: a trigger value derived from a random variable having a non-uniform distribution; a generator for generating a random trigger value at predetermined times (column 14, lines 19-32: states that the random distribution is distributed highly in areas between the limits and not distributed in areas outside of the limit; a receiver for receiving count data from each game console, the count data representing at least one parameter of a game console (column 14, lines 44-49: states monitoring the coin information of each gaming machine); a calculating means for calculating a total value representing the total count data received by the receiver (column 15, lines 1-6: calculates the total count data and compares this value to a trigger value to decide if the two values are equal); a comparator for comparing the total value with the trigger value (column 15, lines 1-6: calculates the total count data and compares this value to a trigger value to decide if the two values are equal); and a processor for outputting a prize signal to at least one game console if the total value has a predetermined relationship with the trigger value (column 15, lines 1-6: calculates the total count data and compares this value to a trigger value to decide if the two values are equal and awards a prize, as also pertains to claim 122).

Re claim 131: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 130 wherein the prize instruction signal is transmitted independent of count data received during an elapsed period (a signal that is transmitted is independent of another signal that is received).

Re claim 134: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 133 including a totalizer operable to calculate a total value representing the total count data stored in the accumulator for each game console (column 7, lines 28-29: the total value is incremented by a particular amount after each bet by the player).

Re claim 135: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 134 wherein each total value calculated by the totalizer is compared with the trigger value and a prize instruction signal is transmitted to the output means if any one or more of the total values has a predetermined relationship with a trigger value (column 15, lines 1-6, 41-45).

Re claim 139: Olsen discloses with respect to the method of claim 138 wherein the total value is recalculated each time count data is received from the at least one game console (column 7, lines 28-29: the total value is incremented by a particular amount after each bet by the player).

Re claim 141: Olsen discloses respect to the method as claimed in claim 140 wherein the display means includes a visual display separate from the at least one game console (column 26, lines 39-48).

Re claim 142: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 130 including the step of providing a plurality of random trigger values with each trigger value being associated with a respective gaming console (the random trigger values are reset after each prize is awarded, and because the trigger values are not distinct, each game machine can have the same trigger value number).

Re claims 148 and 149: Olsen discloses respect to the method as claimed in claim 130 wherein the value of the prize is determined independently of the count data and turnover (column 27, lines 1-13: the value of the prize is determined by a paytable).

Re claims 152-154: Olsen discloses that the comparing step is performed asynchronously with playing the gaming console (column 14, lines 50-52: because the incrementing step is delayed from receiving count data, that is a precursor to the comparison step, the comparison step is performed asynchronously to playing the gaming console).

Re claim 156: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 132 wherein the count data comprises at least one of the following: a predetermined amount wagered on a gaming console (column 14, lines 43-48: all bets made at game machines are either predetermined by game players or game operators).

Re claims 157 and 158: Olsen discloses that the step of providing a new random trigger value at a predetermined time (column 15, lines 51-59).

Re claims 164 and 165: Olsen discloses that the random value is recalculated after the prize instruction signal is output whereby the trigger value is greater than or equal to the total value (column 15, lines 1-6; column 16, lines 51-56).

Re claim 171: Olsen discloses with respect to the controller as claimed in claim 166 wherein a prize signal is output from the processor to the one game console if the total value is equal to or greater than the trigger value (column 15, lines 1-6; column 16, lines 51-56).

5.   Claims 174-176 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Neurizon PTY LTD (AU Pat. No. 1999943453; herein known as Neurizon).

Re claim 174: Neurizon discloses a gaming system comprising: at least one game

console (Fig. 1: object 10: shows a plurality of game consoles); a trigger value generator for

generating for a trigger value (Page 11: a random number generator); a prize triggering means

(column 8, lines 1-4: a bonus mode is triggered that awards prizes to players); and a controller

which is adapted to: periodically receive count data from one game console, the count data

representing at least one parameter of each game console (Page 8, lines 3-9: collects count input

from game machines in meters); and calculate a total value representing the total count data

received by the controller for each game console (Page 8, lines 33-36: each bet is added to the

meter).

Re claim 175: Neurizon discloses with respect to the gaming system as claimed in claim

175, that the trigger value generator comprises a plurality of trigger values each associated with a

respective one of the game consoles (Page 20, tables 4 and 6: for each draw time, a separate

trigger value is determined).

Re claim 176: Neurizon discloses with respect to the gaming system as claimed in claim

175 wherein the trigger value is determined independently of count data received over a

predetermined period of time (Page: 11, lines 24-34: the trigger value is determined by a random

number generator independent of the count value).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7.   Claim 98, 103, 128, and 143, 146, and 160 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,146,273) in view of Marutsas (U.S. Patent No.

3,746,847).

Re claims 98, 103, 128, 143 and 146: Olsen fails to disclose that with respect to the

method as claimed in claim 97 the non-uniform distribution is a geometric distribution.

Marutsas discloses a pseudo-random number generator that generates numbers based on a

geometric distribution (See Abstract and column 6, lines 25-32). Olsen discloses that a plurality

of random number generators are acceptable for use with the game system (column 8, lines 35-

40: the system randomly chooses the bonus trigger according to any of a number of conventional

random number generator programs and column 22, lines 12-13: discloses that it is known in the

art to do random trigger values). Therefore, it would have been obvious to substitute the random

number generator of Olsen for the random number generator of Marutsas to achieve the

predictable results of a game system that generates random numbers with a geometric

distribution.

Re claim 101: Olsen substantially teaches the invention, but fails to disclose with respect

to the method as claimed in claim 97 wherein the random variable is added to a predetermined

offset value to produce the trigger value. However, Olsen does disclose that there is a low limit

for a range of random numbers generated for the purpose of providing a trigger value (column 6,

lines 55-60). It is obvious to one skilled in the art that producing a number by adding a random

number to an offset value is an obvious variant of the system of Olsen wherein the low limit is an

offset value to achieve the predictable results of producing a trigger value that is within a

particular range.

Re claim 102: Olsen discloses with respect to claim 101 wherein the offset value is

calculated and stored in a memory location prior to addition to the random variable (the offset

values must be calculated previously, in order for the random number to be first determined).

8.   Claims 104, 147 and 129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,146,273) in view of Marutsas (U.S. Patent No. 3,746,847) and further

in view of Engineering Statistics Handbook.

Re claims 104 and 147: Olsen and Marutsas fail to disclose that the function includes an

inverse geometric distribution. However, Engineering Statistics Handbook discloses generating

an inverse distribution from a cumulative distribution (Percent Point Function), in which a

geometric distribution is a cumulative distribution. Olsen discloses that a plurality of random

number generators are applicable to the invention. It would have been obvious to one skilled in

the art to modify the random number distribution of Olsen and Marutsas to incorporate an

inverse geometric distribution as taught by Engineering Statistics Handbook, to achieve the predictable result of a random number generator with an inverse geometric distribution.

Re claim 129: Olsen and Marutsas substantially teaches the invention, but fail to disclose with respect to the method as claimed in claim 128 wherein the random variable is added to a predetermined offset value to produce the trigger value. However, Olsen does disclose that there is a low limit for a range of random numbers generated for the purpose of providing a trigger value (column 6, lines 55-60). It is obvious to one skilled in the art that producing a number by adding a random number to an offset value is an obvious variant of the system of Olsen and Marutsas wherein the low limit is an offset value to achieve the predictable results of producing a trigger value that is within a particular range.

9.   Claim 113 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,146,273) in view of Rowe (U.S. Patent No. 6,852,031).

Re claim 113: Olsen substantially teaches the invention, but fails to disclose that a loyalty system including transaction terminals whereby every time a customer makes a transaction count data is transmitted to a central console whereby a person has a chance of winning a jackpot. However, Rowe discloses a loyalty system (column 20, lines :18-22: a loyalty system that allows patrons to accumulate and redeem points) including transaction terminals (column 27-33, 44-46: cashier terminals for purchasing lottery, keno, or electronic pull-tab tickets) whereby every time a customer makes a transaction count data is transmitted to a central console whereby a person has a chance of winning a jackpot (column 27-33, 44-46: a jackpot related to a lottery, keno, or electronic pull-tab game). It would have been obvious to

one skilled in the art to modify the game system of Olsen with the loyalty system that allows

players win jackpots, for the purpose of encouraging players to make more purchases with their

card that will increase revenue to the casino.

10.   Claims 120, 123-125, 144, 145, 159, 162, 163, 167-169, 172 and 173 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,146,273) in view of

Engineering Statistics Handbook.

        Re claim 120 and 159 : Olsen fails to disclose with respect to the method as claimed in

claim 97 including the step of calculating a random value having one probability distribution and

transforming the random value by a predetermined function to generate a random value with a

different probability distribution. However Engineering Statistics Handbook discloses

generating an inverse distribution from a cumulative distribution (Percent Point Function), in

which a geometric distribution is a cumulative distribution. It would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art to modify the random number distribution of Olsen to incorporate an inverse

geometric distribution as taught by Engineering Statistics Handbook, to achieve the predictable

result of a random number generator with an inverse geometric distribution.

        Re claim 123 and 144: Olsen substantially teaches the invention, but fails to disclose the

controller as claimed in claim 121 wherein the trigger value generator is adapted to periodically

select a value of the random variable, calculate an offset value and add this to the random

variable to produce the trigger value. However, Olsen discloses that a random number is

generated in between a range consisting of a high limit and a low limit (column 14, lines 17-18:

discloses that a random number is generated in between a range consisting of a high limit and a

low limit). It is obvious to one skilled in the art that producing a number by adding a random number to an offset value is an obvious variant of the system of Olsen wherein the low limit is an offset value to achieve the predictable results of producing a trigger value.

Re claim 124: Olsen discloses with respect to the controller of claim 123 wherein the trigger value is determined independently of turnover of the gaming system (column 27, lines 1-13: the value of the prize is determined by a paytable).

Re claim 125: Olsen discloses with respect to the controller of claim 124 wherein the random variable has a minimum value of 1 (the random variable must have a value larger than one to trigger a jackpot after an accumulation of monetary input).

Re claim 145: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 144 wherein the offset value is calculated and stored in a memory location prior to addition to the random variable (column 5, lines 53-55 & column 7, lines 53-56: the game controller contains memory wherein the low limit must be stored at some point to perform the random number generator).

Re claim 162: Olsen substantially teaches the invention, but fails to disclose that the offset value is set to the current total value. However, Olsen states that "the current value in the random selector can be initially set to any suitable value, preferably zero (column 14, lines 43-45)". To one skilled in the art the changing of an offset value is in accordance with a design choice made that does not depart from the spirit or the scope of the invention. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the offset value of Olsen for the purpose of generating larger bonus pools.

Re claim 163: Olsen discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 162 wherein the offset value and the random value are selected and a trigger value reset whenever a prize instruction signal is sent to the game console (column 21, lines 32-37).

Re claim 167: Olsen substantially teaches the invention, but fails to disclose that the random variable is added to a predetermined offset value to produce the trigger value. However, Olsen does disclose that there is a low limit for a range of random numbers generated for the purpose of providing a trigger value (column 6, lines 55-60). It is obvious to one skilled in the art that producing a number by adding a random number to an offset value is an obvious variant of the system of Olsen wherein the low limit is an offset value to achieve the predictable results of producing a trigger value that is within a particular range.

Re claim 168: Olsen discloses with respect to the controller as claimed in claim 167 wherein the trigger value is determined independent of turnover of the gaming system (column 6, lines 55-60: the trigger value is determined based on a high low limit and not on turnover).

Re claim 169: Olsen discloses with respect to the controller as claimed in claim 163 wherein the random variable value has a minimum value of one (column 6, lines 55-60: the random variable is at least one since the low limit incorporates at least one game machine).

Re claim 172: Olsen discloses with respect to the controller as claimed in claim 167 wherein the count data includes any one of the group of: a predetermined amount wagered on a gaming console (column 14, lines 44-48: all wagers made at a game machine are either predetermined by a player or by a game operator).

Re claim 173: Olsen discloses with respect to the controller as claimed in claim 167

which is configured to be located remotely from each game console (Fig. 2: shows a game

controller outside the many game machines).

11.   Claim 160 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen (U.S.

Patent No. 6,146,273) in view of Engineering Statistics Handbook and further in further view of

Marutsas (U.S. Patent No. 3,746,847).

Re claim 160: The teachings of Olsen and Engineering Statistics Handbook fail to

disclose that the random value is generated by a pseudo random number generator. However,

Marutsas discloses the use of a pseudo random number generator (See Title). Olsen discloses

that a plurality of random number generators are applicable to the invention. It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the random number distribution of Olsen to

incorporate a psuedo geometric distribution as taught by Marutsas, to achieve the predictable

result of a game machine that operates incorporates a pseudo random number generator to

generate a random number.

12.   Claims 161 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen in view

of Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,146,273) in view of Dauma (AU Pat. No. 200234395 as on record

and disclosed by Applicant).

Re claim 161: Olsen substantially discloses the invention but fails to disclose with respect

to the method as claimed in claim 130 wherein the trigger value is reset more frequently than

once per output of the prize instruction signal. However, Dauma discloses that the trigger value

related to a progressive jackpot game is reset more frequently than once per output of the prize

instruction signal (Page 4, line 10). Resetting the triggering amount would either make more

players eligible due to having already met the triggering amount, or make more players farther

from the triggering amount causing them to play more games. It would have been obvious to

one skilled in the art to modify the invention of Olsen to reset the triggering amount during the

before a prize has been awarded as taught by Dauma for the purpose of adding more excitement

to the game.

13.   Claim 170 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen (U.S.

Patent No. 6,146,273) in view of Engineering Statistics Handbook and further in view of

Neurizon PTY LTD (AU Pat. No. 1999943453; herein known as Neurizon as on record and

disclosed by Applicant).

Re claim 170: teachings of Olsen and Engineering Statistics Handbook fail to disclose

that the controller as claimed in claim 167 wherein the receiver is adapted to receive count data

from a plurality of game consoles and store the count data in separate memory locations

associated with each game console and the calculating means includes an accumulator for

calculating a total value for each game console and the comparator is adapted to compare the

total value for each game console with the trigger value. However, Neurizon discloses that the

receiver is adapted to receive count data from a plurality of game consoles and store the count

data in separate memory locations associated with each game console (Page 8, lines 3-9) and the

calculating means includes an accumulator for calculating a total value for each game console

(Page 8, lines 3-9) and the comparator is adapted to compare the total value for each game

console with the trigger value. The combination of Olsen, Engineering Statistics Handbook and

Neurizon would store and compare count data from each gaming machine against a trigger value,

instead of storing and comparing count data collected from all of the game machines. Because

both Olsen and Engineering Statistics Handbook and Neurizon disclose a method of triggering a

bonus game based on count data, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to

substitute the method of Olsen for the method of Neurizon to achieve the predictable results of a

bonus game being triggered by the amount of count data received for each game machine.

14.   Claims 177-180 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neurizon

PTY LTD (AU Pat. No. 1999943453; herein known as Neurizon).

        Re claims 177: Neurizon teaches the invention substantially, but fails to disclose that the

random variable is added to a predetermined offset value to produce the trigger value. However,

Neurizon discloses a fixed number range wherein the lower limit can be an offset to be added to

the random number (Page 11, lines 27-29). Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled

in the art to modify the random number of Neurizon to be added to an offset to achieve the

predictable results of a random number within a particular range.

        Re claim 178: Neurizon discloses that the gaming system as claimed in claim 177

wherein the trigger value is calculated based on a parameter indicative of the probability of a win

(Page 11, lines 35-37: the limits of Johnson are parameters related to the probability of a win,

wherein the highest limit is related to a loss and the lowest limit is related to a win).

        Re claim 179: Neurizon discloses with respect to the gaming system as claimed in claim

178 wherein the trigger value is selected independently of an amount wagered on each gaming

console over an elapsed period (Page: 11, lines 24-34: the trigger value is determined by a

random number generator independent of the count value).

Re claim 180: Neurizon discloses with respect to the method as claimed in claim 179

wherein the controller is located externally from the at least one game console (Fig. 1: object

13A discloses a controller).

15.   Claim 181 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neurizon PTY

LTD (AU Pat. No. 1999943453; herein known as Neurizon as on record and disclosed by

Applicant) in view of Engineering Statistics Handbook.

Re claim 181: Neurizon fails to disclose that the step of calculating a random value

having one probability distribution and transforming the random value by a predetermined

function to generate a random value with a different probability distribution. However

Engineering Statistics Handbook discloses generating an inverse distribution from a cumulative

distribution (Percent Point Function), in which a geometric distribution is a cumulative

distribution. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the random number

distribution of Neurizon to incorporate an inverse geometric distribution as taught by

Engineering Statistics Handbook, to achieve the predictable result of a random number generator

with an inverse geometric distribution.

16.   Claim 182 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neurizon PTY

LTD (AU 1999943453 herein known as Neurizon) in view of Acres (U.S. Patent No. 6,231,445).

Re claim 182: Neurizon discloses with respect to the gaming system as claimed in claim 176 wherein the prize triggering means includes a prize setting means which is adapted to set the value of the prize awarded to the game console receiving the prize instruction signal based on a fixed value determined before count data is received from the or each game console. However, Acres, discloses a fixed jackpot for players to be awarded during a bonus period according to a payout table (column 2, lines 57-66). Because both Neurizon and Acres discloses methods to award a bonus amount, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute the method of awarding prizes of Neurizon for the method of Acres to achieve the predictable results of awarding players a bonus amount based on a fixed paytable.

Conclusion

17.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REGINALD A. RENWICK whose telephone number is (571)270-1913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30AM-5:00PM, Alt Fridays, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dmitry Suhol can be reached on 571-272-4430. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joe H Cheng/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3714

/R. A. R./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/Pierre E. Elisca/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714